

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1 to 12 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of this amendment and the following remarks.

The Examiner, in the first item of the Office Action, indicates that claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner indicates as follows.

Claim recites the limitation "said air". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In response to the Examiner's indication, claim 10 has been amended as set forth the above, without adding any additional subject matter. The amendment to claim 10 has been made with an intention of correcting a simple error in the existing specification, and, therefore, is within the scope of the application disclosure as originally filed. In view of the amendment, it is submitted that the Examiner's indication is no longer applicable to the present application.

The Examiner, in the fourth item of the Office Action, indicates that claims 1, 2, and 4 to 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US/5,208,730 to Tracy.

Further, the Examiner, in the fifth item of the Office Action, indicates that claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the Examiner's indication, claim 1 has been amended as set forth above to incorporate the limitation defined in claim 2 and claim 3. Accordingly, claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. In view of the amendment to claim 1, the Examiner's

indication is no longer applicable to claim 1.

Claims 4, 5 and 9 have been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claims 4 to 12 are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable for the same reason that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

For the above reasons it is believed that the application and claims as amended are now in proper condition for allowance, and reconsideration and early allowance of the amended application is respectfully solicited.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36135.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:



Michael W. Garvey, No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: May 31, 2005